



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Still all these causes are merely derivative, and the author fails to assign a place to the purely social factor—the natural craving of every human being for social intercourse with his own kind. “Whitechapel makes in many respects practically the impression of a city of the Jewish pale of settlement in Russia” (p. 26)—this in itself is sufficient to draw to it thousands of Russian Jews who may no longer be attached to it by economic ties.

A brief consideration of these conditions shows the utter futility of the efforts of charitable institutions to bring relief by encouraging “dispersion” of immigrants throughout the country.

On the whole, the importance of the Jewish Board of Guardians is very much overrated by the author, whereas the tenement-house policy of the London County Council and the Borough Council of Stepney has been considered by him as not within the scope of his inquiry (p. 37). Yet it must be obvious that the problem is one which can be adequately dealt with only by the municipality.

ISAAC A. HOURWICH.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BOURGUIN'S EXAMINATION OF SOCIALISM¹

M. Maurice Bourguin has made an interesting and valuable examination of socialism and social problems. His book is in summary a detailed analysis of the several social systems proposed by the contemporary socialist groups, a painstaking review of the leading facts of modern capitalistic society, and, finally, the author's conclusions as to how far the actual economic evolution justifies the socialist theory and expectations.

In his study of socialism, which makes up the first part of his book, M. Bourguin has included “every system which implies suppression, reduction, or diffusion of capitalistic revenues by instituting, beside or in place of individual rights, collective rights in things for the profit of communities more or less vast.” Such a definition of socialism might cover almost every type of social reform movement, whether anarchism, communism, co-operation, or the mildest demands for state ownership of public utilities. Our author has, however, excluded from his discussion anarchism and communism; anarchism because, although a plan for the suppression of capitalistic revenues, it supposes in addition the suppression of all central or

¹ *Les systèmes socialistes et l'évolution économique.* By Maurice Bourguin. Paris: Armand Colin, 1904.

even local police power, and the absence of all general laws regulating individual or collective action ; and communism because it aims to control the consumption as well as the production and distribution of the social product.

To classify his socialist systems, M. Bourguin has abandoned the usual, somewhat empty, merely categorical, separation into Christian socialism, utopian socialism, and the like, and has used as basis of distinction economic differences — differences in regard to the state control of value and of the means of production. He thus distinguishes four kinds of socialism: (1) pure collectivism, (2) state socialism, (3) communal socialism, (4) corporative socialism. The term "pure collectivism" he applies to all the systems which prescribe a central control of production and hold that values should be expressed by units of labor. This, the most generally advocated type of socialism, he sums up as the belief that society is tending more or less gradually to "integral socialization of all the means of production, those of the peasant, the artisan, and the small shopkeeper, as well as those of the capitalist;" is tending toward "an organization where production will be exactly adjusted to needs, where distribution will, at least during a period of transition, be according to the proportion of labor furnished by each member of society, and where, finally, all possible divergence between labor value and the price resulting from supply and demand will be eliminated," and metallic money, "even as a sign of the time of social labor," will be excluded. The name "state socialism" he applies to those systems which intrust a whole or a part of production to the state, but do not aim to alter arbitrarily present methods of determining value. "Communal socialism" covers such theories as would have the communal group "free to regulate their economic relations," while "corporative socialism" "supposes that no one in the association may claim an individual right over collective capital, nor make personal claim on the product." The last two classifications seem to lack much real force. Schemes for establishing autonomous groups which would come under the headings of communal or corporative socialisms, as defined by M. Bourguin, might be part of the plans proposed either by anarchists or certain individualists or Marxists. Besides, the distinction in these last two classes seems really based on a political rather than on an economic, difference. The classification is sound enough, however, in the first two cases, and in the chapters which follow it is these two types of social systems which receive the most attention.

Part I is a careful presentation of certain aspects of each of the more important types of socialism, minor differences of opinion being scrupulously recognized. It is refreshing to be able to note that M. Bourguin departs from the mistaken usage of the average writer on socialism who continues at the beginning of the twentieth century to base all his statements concerning socialism on the somewhat outworn prophets of 1850. It is not only Marx and Engels, but the best-known contemporary socialist theorists and political leaders, from whom these studies in socialism are drawn. Bebel, Kautsky, Jaurès, Deville, Vandervelde, and Destrée furnish the text for the discussion of pure collectivism; Georges Renard, Grönlund, and Sulzer, whose several systems are considered together because in common they believe it possible to combine the free play of demand and supply with payment in labor units, as socialists one degree removed from pure collectivism; Millerand's *Le socialisme réformiste* serves as the principal basis in the discussion of state socialism; Paul Brousse and Anton Menger are chosen as the conspicuous exponents of communal socialism; and the systems proposed by Hertzka, Oppenheimer, Gide, and Andler are explained, along with some of the co-operative movements of the day, as examples of corporative socialism. Marxists will probably not have patience with Bourguin when he cites Bellamy, a Christian socialist, Jaurès, a "parliamentary" socialist, or Hertzka, more commonly classed as an anarchist, all in connection with the same given question of socialistic doctrine; but there is justification enough for this grouping. The several schools of socialists which are today clamoring for a hearing really separate but slightly on fundamental questions of doctrine. Marxists do not really disagree with Bellamyites or "parliamentarians," because these latter are Christians or idealists, nor because they fail to recognize the desirability of a collectivist state; for, as a rule, they have common aspirations in this direction. The dividing difference is really one of tactics. The student of doctrines may therefore justifiably cite these several writers together, as M. Bourguin has done.

The reader who peruses the first part of M. Bourguin's book gets a vigorous and able account of the several schools of the contemporary socialist movement, but it is a statement of only one aspect of their theories. M. Bourguin has evidently adopted the sound view that a reformer proves his right to a hearing not so much by what he has to say against existing social conditions as by what he proposes

to substitute for the institutions he decries, and he has therefore elected to discuss only such of the doctrines as bear upon the character which society is likely to assume in the future. The exposition gains in brevity, strength, and novelty on this account, for, especially in regard to Marxian socialism, to select the constructive theories and insist upon them, is to deserve well of the reader seeking education.

Marxian socialists habitually refrain from explicitly outlining the socialistic state. They proudly claim that it is enough to show the weaknesses of the capitalistic society, and to show how the forces that evolved it are making for its gradual alteration to a society where economic functions are to be more highly centralized. Such a demonstration, they say, is all that any candid person need ask in order to join them in furthering the natural and necessary social evolution. To such a demonstration, they insist, they confine themselves, leaving the future society gradually to develop when the first aim, the control of productive goods, shall have been accomplished. Evidently, M. Bourguin, like Schäffle, does not recognize any such pretension to lack of imagination or the power of foretelling. He sagely argues that, since Marxists—that is, “pure collectivists”—greet with scorn every attempt of those who adopt the same general theory of social evolution as themselves to outline a society which represents any compromise with the present economic system, this scorn must rest on some plan of their own, and this plan, this ideal, M. Bourguin easily finds expressed in their writings, and details for the reader's benefit. He defers criticism of them until he has reviewed the actual facts of industrial growth.

To such a review Part II is devoted, and the plan of thus measuring socialism in the light of carefully collected statistics is one of the chief merits of M. Bourguin's book. He describes with detail the characteristic results of the introduction and continued use of mechanical processes. The growth of large capitals, and the concentration of production through pools, trusts, and similar monopolies; the alterations which capitalistic production has worked in commerce, in small industries, and in agricultural conditions; the extension of the economic rôle of the state, not only as it has come to control and protect economic activities by way of factory and labor legislation, but as it has itself undertaken industrial enterprises; the growing use of the method of collective bargaining, and the rise and rapid increase in all parts of the world of co-operative societies for the production, distribution, and exchange of commodities—these

industrial changes are in turn laid before the reader with strict attention to the most recent statistical findings. Numberless references to pamphlets and reports, and nine carefully prepared and instructive statistical appendices, show with what scruple and industry M. Bourguin has tried to get at the actual facts in the end of answering the question: "Collectivism next or not? If not, what next?"

Our author is confident that it is not a Marxian society which the social transformation is preparing. To this type of society he objects, and this not only because he feels intellectually convinced, as most people do, that pure collectivism jeopardizes individual liberty as much as, if not more than, the competitive system endangers it, and not only because it seems to his judgment likely to develop static conditions in industry by limiting and stunting the desires of the individual. Trained to believe in conclusions based on a study of reality, M. Bourguin might be willing to suspect his judgment if based on preconceived principles; but he does not doubt when he has facts to support it, and he objects to pure collectivism most of all because the facts do not support its "laws" of social growth. Statistics are against the "law of concentration of capital." Neither in agriculture nor in many of the smaller skilled industries has this "law" acted, nor does it show any tendency so to act. M. Bourguin even sees in the facts before him certain data which suggest that some trades—particularly those that minister to the more luxurious and æsthetic tastes in food, clothing, and furnishings—are tending to deconcentration and to return to earlier types of production.

The "scientific" pretensions of the Marxists are as usual, and with just discrimination, much belittled. M. Bourguin thinks them more properly called "determinist philosophers," "*calvinistes sans Dieu*," who have adopted a theory of predestination wherein environment plays the rôle of the power determining the elect. To cite Marx and his school as followers of Rousseau, as men using the deductive method and believing in original goodness, is certainly to run very wide of their estimation of themselves; is perhaps, indeed, somewhat to overaccent the peace and harmony which they expect to realize through the domination of the proletariat, and the consequent reign of free will; but here again M. Bourguin's position is perfectly tenable. If men who call themselves economic determinists can yet bravely pin all their hope upon the power of the state in the service of a system—a hope which is nothing more than the belief, as M.

Bourguin points out, "in the power of the will in the service of reason;" if they can expect, as our author's citations show, that the coming social revolution will cause the disappearance of barracks, prisons, and tribunals of justice, because vice, crime, and misery will have disappeared, they certainly lay themselves open to a charge of idealism—a charge which, by the way, some of the less system-bound of the socialists, men like Bernstein or Vandervelde, are themselves willing to acknowledge.

M. Bourguin next weighs the claims of state socialism. With regard to this type, the case, says M. Bourguin, is different from pure collectivism.

The reality is in part favorable and in part against it. It is favorable to it by the incontestable progress of industrial, commercial, and financial centralization, and by the extension of enterprises of the state and the municipalities; it is opposed by the spontaneous development of independent associations refractory to the administrative yoke; by the unbreakable firmness of agriculture on a small scale supported by agricultural societies; by the survival of a multitude of industrial and commercial establishments of which the greater part preserve their *raison d'être* alongside the larger establishments and do not seem in any sense to disappear.

Co-operation, says M. Bourguin, is, of all the forms of conscious association for better economic advantage to each member of society, that which promises most; and yet co-operation, well-grown and growing though the movement be, is nearly insignificant, as compared with what must be accomplished before all production could assume the co-operative form.

M. Bourguin is of the elect who recognize that to disprove socialist systems is not necessarily to disprove that social progress is away from strict individualism. His conclusions as to the direction of social growth, contained in Part III, merit special attention.

While, as has been said, M. Bourguin is wholly certain that all men who dispassionately consider facts must see that it is not a Marxian society, with its regulated desire and payments in labor units, which the times are preparing, he is equally certain that social growth seems to favor "a more regular and co-ordinated organization of social activities." He adopts frankly the idea that the economic evolution is bringing increased powers for economic reconstruction and construction to the state:

A grand historical current which no human power can stop or turn aside is making for a greater connexity of economic interests, and so will establish in

the future, on the basis of economic interests, that unity of civilization which community of religious beliefs developed in the Europe of the Middle Ages.

This does not mean, however, that our author adopts the economic interpretation of history as Marxists advance it. It is an historical determinism somewhat like that of Buckle which he apparently accepts. Physical and economic conditions are undoubtedly factors of social growth, but "factors whose force diminish as ideas of morals and of law develop into fixed facts whose potency increases as civilization grows more complex." Current ideas of morals and of law have, he believes, developed an idea of justice which sums up as an insistent aspiration toward "greater security, well-being, and culture" for the masses of men; but M. Bourguin sees, as all reflective minds must perceive, the fallacy of the socialist allegation that it is increased misery which has developed and quickened the demand for better conditions. It is not increased poverty, but increased well-being, increased moral and intellectual education, which have spread this democratic ideal of the possibility of better distributing the rewards of industry. Men now generally ask that society minimize misery for all, says M. Bourguin, because there has grown up the "spirit of the hive," and men have become keenly conscious that each of us is not the "autonomous center of the universe" which he once fancied himself, but part of the community — one who owes most of what he is to the social surroundings in which he finds himself. "Individualism has changed its nature and can no longer be conceived in any other way than fortified by association."

It is possible, says M. Bourguin, that the advance of association of effort is going to increase the number of wage-earners; but this need not dismay anybody. It does not imply disagreeable alterations in the life of the individual; for it is perfectly possible to foresee how everything is preparing for the gradual removal of the more serious disabilities at present attaching to wage labor. Low wages, long hours, unsanitary conditions, and crises which bring enforced idleness to the able-bodied are beginning to be partially, and can ultimately be entirely, controlled by intelligent state action.

M. Bourguin sees in legislation the only effective way to social betterment. Belief in the benevolent individual as a means for the amelioration of social evils is wisely relegated to the days of Samuel Smiles — without mention, however, of that "unconscious perverter" of English-speaking youth — on the ground that such influences lack "the really educative power vital to the generalized progress of the

masses." Trade-unionism is pronounced almost equally ineffective. The fact is recognized that the unions have given the requisite opportunity for self-expression by self-government to a certain part of the working-class, but it is also pointed out that they have everywhere finally had to resort to legal enactment in order to give any permanence to their aims, besides having been impotent in aiding the larger part of the working-class made up of the children, the women, and the unskilled. As a means for natural and permanent reforms, therefore, legislation is deemed the method which the times are preparing,

a legislation which traces equitably for the unions the limits of their rights and their responsibilities, . . . a legislation which organizes the several professions by giving them their counsels elected by syndicates of employers and workingmen, and which will invest these counsels with certain powers concerning workingmen's insurance, regulation of labor, conciliation and arbitration, and generalized assistance for incapables.

The ultimate conclusions of *Les systèmes socialistes* are therefore that the swift alterations in mechanical production are not preparing us for any one of the systems offered by socialistic groups, but that a more acute demand for general well-being is leading, and is going increasingly to lead, democratic governments to undertake a larger control of industrial operations. Political democracy is developing industrial democracy. The individual trained by the past to submit to the majority will in the political order, must and will learn to do the same in the economic order, and even though some independence be thus risked, there will be a parallel gain of more social support and a greater certainty of livelihood. In short, according to M. Bourguin, the tendency of the times is "in the direction of a capitalistic state of collective organization and democracy, in which the working-classes will grow in power, in wealth, and in culture," and wherein individual property and wages will still exist; for without pretending that they are eternal institutions, the evidence of history being to the contrary, and granting that they will be modified by the progressive emancipation of the working-class, there still remains nothing tangible to suggest their early disappearance.

M. Bourguin has reached conclusions not very far removed from those of the right of the socialist movement. His ideas concerning the outlook for civilization seem to fall under his own definition of socialism; for he decides, from a study of the facts, that the economic evolution shows that there is to be a gradual reduction of

the capitalistic revenues by the increased recognition of collective rights alongside individual rights. He really separates from such socialists as in his own land are called parliamentary socialists or opportunists, or from the Fabians or the "Revisionists" of Germany, only in so far as he is more willing than they to have patience with the established forms of society. He is willing to believe that a better and more normal collective life may best be brought about by the gradual adoption of simple reform measures. His theory may fairly be said to be—to use the expression of one of his own countrymen—a "socialism without a doctrine." Of the same class as our own Edmond Kelly, he is a free-lance socialist, indorsing the fundamental biographical, ethical, and political premises of the best "militant" socialism and the fundamental changes it proclaims, and denying only their errors of economic theory and political tactics—errors springing from an overappreciation of the rights and powers of labor; errors which were manufactured in the heat of revolutionary fever and under the influence of an age of *a priori* reasoning; errors which are the remnants of a time when men were imbued with a settled rancor against aggressive and reactionary governments, or palpitating in a first sensitive rebellion against a human misery to which they had only just become alive; errors which have since been perpetuated by men who adopt blindly rather than think for themselves.

Les systèmes socialistes is, then, an enlightened criticism of the elder socialisms—a criticism which should force socialists to look their own constructive theories in the face and own their unsightliness; and it is also the statement of the fundamental principles for a socialism of a broader, sounder kind—a socialism toward which most thinkers of the day are inclining, however much they may, for the sake of the past, name it individualism, with a new interpretation of the limits of the police power; a socialism which depends for its successful issue upon the administrative capacity of men chosen by democratic majorities.

And herein lies material for further investigation. For the inquirer concerning the direction of social progress and the claims of socialists is it not democracy which, in the last analysis, is on trial—democracy which today lays itself open to charges of unstable or unsound judgment, and, to put it kindly, of extreme administrative awkwardness? This form of social control M. Bourguin, as well as the socialists, seems to feel is to become the permanent custodian of

men's civic relations, even where these are increasingly to intrude upon their industrial activities. Facts show that we are tending to industrial centralization, says M. Bourguin, and that we are tending to intrust the control of these centralized operations to government; but he does not bring facts to show that we are inalterably to have democracy. He takes that for granted. With all the bias of his nation in favor of it, he views democracy as something axiomatic. He cheerily recognizes the vices of our democracies. He enumerates them as popular envy, class spirit, intriguing ambition, and corruption; but he matches these with the race pride, caste spirit, violence of egotistical passions, barbarism of punishments, spirit of intrigue, and corruption of courts, which characterized past ages; and he further urges that the virtues of other forms of social organization are easily equaled and surpassed by the virtue of democratic times, the sentiment of independence and personal dignity, of fraternal pity, devotion to science, and generous activity in the cause of the people. All this may be true, and yet it seems curiously short-sighted to omit from a study of social evolution any inquiry as to whether democracy, whatever its virtues or vices, is to be the permanent method for conducting social affairs. I have no disposition to deny that it is not to be the permanent form, although I own serious doubts. I only urge that it is meet and proper to inquire, by means of the current facts of political growth, whether or not it is to be the future basis of economic activity, before deciding positively, as M. Bourguin has done, that it is to underlie the economic changes he foresees. That he has taken democracy to be absolute, while so carefully recognizing the relativity of economic facts, marks a limitation in M. Bourguin's book—a limitation which he shares with most other socialistic writers. It would be desirable for someone with less bias than Mr. Lecky to make the inquiry.

In spite of thus confining himself to economic research, and yet pronouncing on political conditions as well, M. Bourguin's book makes timely reading. In the midst of so much conventional discussion of the possible coming, and the "ought to be," of socialism, we need careful inquiries such as this of M. Bourguin. Every thinking man today who is not careless of human misery, or who has blood enough to be angered by the persistence of force and fraud in a highly conscious and complex civilization, finds at some time a social democrat who will present to him a picture of social harmony that will fire his imagination, stir the noblest aspirations of which he is capable,

and tempt him to join a "class-conscious fight" for better conditions. To such a one, books like the volume under consideration are of special interest. It is of vital importance that these alluring pictures be weighed against facts; for to join a movement, however high its ideals, which has mistaken its bearings and is steering by the blinding light of a fixed system, is only to delay a much-to-be-desired progress of society toward better methods of social adjustment.

JESSICA B. PEIXOTTO.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.